

(1)

TO THE  
**Anti-Quaker**  
**MISORCUS**  
CONCERNING  
**OATHS**

**A** Strange forreign Name, come from *Rome* or *Constantinople*, as the *illiterate Quaker* may think (he for whom he pretends to have taken such Pains) who being better acquainted with Scripture-Language, and seeing his whole Endeavours through his Book employed in Opposing the Command of Christ, and adjuring men to break it by Swearing, thinks it might have been far more truly, properly & pertinently **ANTICHRIST'S EXORCIST**, as one likely to have such an Office in that Synagogue, as the highest Preferment he has been capable to attain. And the rather because after the innate Principle thereof he takes upon him immediately after the mention of his weak Endeavours in Doctrine, to ad ure the Magistrate to severe Discipline, only short of killing the *Quakers*; they that delivered the *Martyrs* to be burned, used as mild Expressions. But whether they will obey the Doctrine or no, they must not know their dogmatical Doctor further then by his *Mystical Name*, for fear (it seems) to have that laid (which he casts upon us) where it is due, which he calls *Calumnies, Reproaches, Railings, Invectives*, against which he sayes there is no Fence for the most unspotted Innocence, and such may he think there

A

is

Jenks

BX7741

R5T6

(2)

is not against his, who hiding himself throws them at us, and bespatters us for our dissenting from his Opinions, which (in ours) rather deserves the *Epithetes* he bestows. But what Reason has he to fear, seeing in all our Treatise he cannot find it done to any Name there, though many dissenting from us at very great Distances; but that we rather there shew our selves willing to own the Truth in all, where we can find it in any measure, passing by the other; yea, even in some that have given as severe and uncharitable a Character of us, as he has, which, for that Cause he revives and returns upon us, being offended that any should mention any Truth, that we might agree with them in, and own, accounting that a Detraction from their Reputation, to whose Person he confesses we have not spoken any thing derogatory (neither to any in our whole Treatise of Oaths) And his Words, namely, Bp. *Gauden's*, he does not deny, neither the purport of them; only he is offended they are to our Purpose: As he is also at *Robert Sanderson's*, afterward Bishop, whereto he is not ashamed to say, *There is not a Syllable thereof in that Page, viz. 141. printed 1670. in the 5th Lecture, De Obligatione Juramenti.* Let any that understands *Latine* but look the Page towards the Beginning, and see if there be not *Twenty Eight Syllables*, a whole Sentence, an entire Proposition betwixt two full Points, *viz. Non opus fuit ista novo interdicto prohibere quae ex se erant semper illicita.* There was not need by a New Interdiction to prohibit those things, which of themselves were alwayes unlawful. Because he cannot mis-interpret this Man as he does *Jerome*, he takes another course, a shameful one, to tell a gross Lye, in denying there are any such words, taking Advantage belike of the supposed Perfunctoriness, Credulity or Ignorance of his Readers, thinking they would take all on his Word, without Examination, which is great Injustice. Else he durst not affirm what he does of *Chrysostom*; for if any look into the Places cited by us, he may evidently see the contrary; and a Man that durst shew his Face, not brazen, durst not for very Shame say as he does, *That his Saying, at least, where there is no Necessity, does therefore allow it, and authorize it; contrary to all the rest he writes.* These Three are all (with *Jerome*) he meddles with in his Preface, which is all we hear

of

53636



of after so long Expectation, and so return this in short; which is enough for a Dogmatical we know not who.

But as for *Jerom's* Translation and Interpretation that he makes, he has shewed himself as bad a moral Man as divine; for he leaves out of him [*But the Truth of the Gospel receives not an Oath, seeing every faithful Word is for an Oath*] He might with as good Reason leave out of *Christ's* Speech, *But I say unto you, Swear not at all*: in the meantime charging us with leaving out that which even the Unlearned may read in our Book, all but [*us*] which is not *Jerom's*, but his; and yet is not ashamed to tell them, *He shall for their Benefit translate it Word for Word*: And if so, how is it that he never charges us with leaving out [*us*] a principal Word that determines for him, unless it were taken indefinitely, as [*We*] before for *Men*, as sometimes by *Paul* and *James*, the Apostles: and why charges he us not with adding all that restrictive part aforesaid, which is to be read in ours, and not his? Can it be expected, that the Man that charges us with leaving out that which in plain *English* is there to be seen, with our Observation on it, would be so favourable, as to pass by our leaving out that principal Word for him, and adding the principal part for us too of the whole Comment in *ENGLISH*, if it were not in the *LATINE*. The *Quaker* is not so unlearned as not to perceive these things; and to know and discern the Voice of the true Shepherd from the Stranger, and him that hides himself, and thinks *he may say any thing, and not be aspersed*, as he sayes, that is, *charged with his lyes and deceit*. Can he account him a true Shepherd that flees and hides himself from those he accounts the Woolves Prey, and be so rash and careless (to say the least) in the Work he sayes he undertakes for their Benefit and Recovery, as to examine and compare things no better, and then be so bitter against them for his own Negligence, as to set the Magistrate at work? Hath not the *Quaker* learned so much as to know, that such a one careth not for the Sheep, and therefore is a Hireling? He can find no Benefit in receiving by an implicit Faith, as of old, a *Latin Comment* from a Priest's Mouth, that distinguishes nothing between the *Commands of the Law* and the *Gospel* by his Interpretation, which he has cause to suspect, as aforesaid. And also that after Tythes, he

will come for Offerings and Sacrifices too. And if they will not give the Priest raw Flesh, he will take it by force before he burn the Fat: And can he believe that he Translates it for his Benefit, that like the *Rhemists* leaves *Victims* and *Demons* untranslated, that he may come to him for a new Interpretation, and yet knows not where, nor what is his Name, unless it be *St. Jerom*, so not only *Christening* but *Sainting* himself. For instead of confirming his Interpretation, or explaining it out of other places of the same Father (as one would think by his appeal he would have done) he asks the Question, *Doth St. Jerom say any such thing?* And answers himself, *I absolutely deny it*, without further proof, but his own forged Interpretation, and dogmatical Assertion, the Authority of this new spurious *Jerome*. For as for the ancient Father *Jerome*, the *Illiterate Quaker* need but turn back the Leaf in our Treatise of Oaths, and there he may find, that in one of his Epistles, he writes, that "We must not blaspheme, and say, the Lord forbade us, what he did himself: And sayes, *That we that are Servants must not think to do as the Lord did*; which this man dare not say was Swearing falsely or vainly: For that were to blaspheme with a witness. But yet he saith, to take off that Objection, *After the Lord forbade us to Swear, neither did he ever Swear himself*: May not therefore the *Illiterate Quaker* from this place justly suspect, that he has put [us] not in ours, into his Translation, which makes the Father contradict himself, whom he has a better belief in, then his false Son. And may not the *Illiterate Quaker* justly suspect his [if] and his [should] which he finds not in ours to be of the same Progeny? Seeing it thrusts out a whole Sentence (to make his fence) which he finds in ours, for none of which passages he taxes ours; which certainly he would have done, if we had given him that Advantage, he may think, he finds him not so favourable: Neither doth he find him disapproving our Translating [by God] which he without any instance opposes with his Translating [against God] for as for ours there may be an Instance in the same place, for there [ἱερουσόλυμα] is rendered by *Pagninus* and *Arias Montanus* [in Jerusalem] by our Translators [by Jerusalem] not [against Jerusalem] answerable to *ירושלם*. But that his learned Brethren



Brethren of the Ministry (as he owns them) may take notice how learnedly this their Brother has come to their Assistance against us; let them consider that by his Forgery he has not only made the learned Father break his own Head by Contradiction, and other learned Fathers his Contemporaries, as Hilary, Chromatins, &c. who with others agree with him, saying, "Observe that Christ here not only Reproves the Jews Superstition of old, but also Forbids his to Swear. (And to them we appeal for Jerom, as well as to himself: But also, he makes him also desperately to break (his Contemporary also) Priscian the Grammarian's Head. And we do not read, he bare him such ill-will, shewing himself as bad Grammarian as Moral or Divine: For besides the [quasi. as] of similitude, coupling [parvulis] to [Judæis] understood; he forges another [quasi, as if] of simulation to serve to [fuerat] the indicative, and thinks he has got a great advantage (*tanquam fecerit ipse aliquid*) that he has got [fuerat] instead of fuit: Which, alas! is none at all, for fuerat makes more for us, then fuit. He sayes, it's not [fuit] and say we, it's not [fuisset] oh, but, sayes he, it's [fuerat] quasi non norimus, that [quasi] of Simulation [as if] requires a Subjunctive, and not an Indicative. Let any Boy look in his Grammar, and prove this learned Translator for the Illiterate Quaker, and for his [quasi parvulis] he will write him therein [Hæreticus majusculis] as his properest name: And to make this pass, he forges a distinction after [hoc] to make it accusative [this] and out of it another [hoc] a Nominative [it.] And so with this great *literate man*, these little Notes of sence [but's, not's, if's and and's] are but as Nonsense and Metaphysical Notions, as Insignificant Nothings, to be multiplied or subtracted at pleasure. This shews he has learned these and the other Arts he speaks of very notably, or the art of Grammar very sorrily. What would this Man have done, if he had lived at that time, and had the Translating of Matthews's Book, or had had the handling of Jerom's Works before Erasmus; he would have been a notable Artist in the Expurgatory Office: And as if he had learned it there, and were to Practice it among Protestants; he shews what he would do, (if it were seizable and permitted) by Bishop Sanderfon; for  
he

he would not leave one Syllable *un-obliturated*, that made against him or his Party. But the Lord's Mercy has rescued these our Times and Places from any ones expectation of any such attempt. We say not *Bishop Gauden* and *Bishop Sanderson* are against Swearing at all; but we say, what we cite out of them is truly cited: whose words one would have thought, he would have made it his business, not to deny, and oppose with several Reasons, as if they had been Forged by us: But to have defended, and shewn to what purpose they had been, if not to ours, if he could; and so to have shewn his Art.

But we say, That *Jerom* and *Chrysostom* and those learned Fathers, with several others are against it; as they that will make tryal, will be able to judge, if they do it without Prejudice; and to that we refer it, against all his *Slanders*, *Forgings* and *Wrestings*, which are not worth answering, they are so gross. What are of any moment in his Arguments are answered already to others, only this at present to what is cited by him out of *Bishop Sanderson*, saying, *Swearing is not Ceremonial, and must continue, because Controversies must*. We deny that Strife and Controversie must endure; especially such Controversies for the ending of which Oaths were permitted, they must fail, and Charity never fail. *Controversie* is not of an *everlasting Nature*, as *Love* that is moral, is, upon this ground *Swearing* must fail. And so is not Moral but Ceremonial; as may be shewed by the definition of a Ceremony from two Bishops, *J. Wilkins*, and *W. Floyd*, in the real *Character*. For there Ceremony is defined a *solemn Circumstance*, which is an external mode, wherewith things are accompanied and done: Now without this the controversie failes betwixt us, for abate us the solemn Circumstance wherewith it is accompanied & done, the thing, confessing Truth, speaking in the fear of God, we do not refuse. The Circumstances denominates and determines it *Swearing*. For the number Seven, as the word [*sheba*] signifies, is a *Circumstance* used by the *Ancients* about it, as appears, *Gen. 21.* the first place we find the word in: And so is *yicreth berith* יצרת ברית they made a Covenant, the same with *Ferire Fædus* used by the *Heathen*. The Substance of the old *Swearing*, which the Apostle calls *Confessing*, *Rom. 14. 11.* we deny not. It is the

Ce-



(7)

Ceremony, Circumstance and Solemnity you contend with us for, which is Swearing, if Judicial it binds not.

Yet this Man is not ashamed to expostulate, **WHATSOEVER IS COMMANDED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, IS IT NOT COMMANDED IN THE NEW;** making no Distinction of Judicial, Ceremonial and Moral, and making it heinous to affirm the contrary. Who knoweth what he would be at ?

*By One subscribed to the Treatise of OATHS,  
with Consent of the Rest,*

R. R.

---

THE END.

---

Ceremony, Circumstance and Solemnity you contend with  
us for which is swearing, if Judicial it be not.  
For the Man is not allowed to expellate, WHATSO.  
EVER IS COMMANDED IN THE OLD TESTA-  
MENT, IS IT NOT COMMANDED IN THE NEW;  
making no Distinction of Judicial, Ceremonial and Moral,  
and making it better to affirm the contrary. Who knows it  
what he would be at?

It is our duty to the Tribunal of OATHS,  
and God is the Judge.

R. R.

THE END.



